



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/729,772

12/08/2003

Erik de Groot

I20 05001US

3423

128 7590 12/23/2008
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

DAO, THUY CHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,772	DE GROOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Dao	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 30, 2008.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24 and 25 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. In the instant amendment, claims 12, 22, 24 and 25 have been amended; claim 23 has been canceled.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments have been considered.

a) Claims 1-4 and 6-21 in view of Dardinski and Hammack (Remarks, pp. 10-11):

The Applicants asserted, "...The Examiner admits that Dardinski does not teach the above noted recital but notes that Hammack does, citing column 11, lines 34-44. This citation deals with user selection of manual or automatic check-in and checkout, and not with manual and automatic version numbering..." (Remarks, page 10, last paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants' assertions. As set forth in the previous Office action mailed July 1, 2008 (pp. 3-4), Dardinski explicitly teaches *automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object of said objects* (e.g., an object as Control Algorithm object, col.79: 21-25, col.77: 51-60; FIGs. 46-47, setting version number, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38).

Dardinski discloses manual/automatic source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said selected and enabled source control level*.

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, options "Manual or Prompt user for Checkout", "Auto Check Out", or "Auto Check Out and In", col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, selecting one of the options and clicking "OK", col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57) and

automatically setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; FIG. 10, with "Auto Check Out and In", automatically increasing the version numbers from 1 to 8); or

manually setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; col.12: 1-24; after selecting "Manual Checkout" in FIG. 8, manually "Undo CheckOut" in FIG. 6-7 to keep the version number as before checkout, col.10: 15-37).

b) Claims 22 and 24-25 in view of Dardinski, Cronic, and Hammack (Remarks, pp. 11-12):

As noted above in the discussion of independent claim 1, the combination of Dardinski and Hammack fully teaches "*automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level.*"

In conclusion, the examiner respectfully maintains grounds of the 35 USC §103 rejections over claims 1-4, 6-22, 24 and 25.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2192

6. Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski (art of record, US 6,754,885) in view of Hammack (art of record, US Patent No. 6,449,624).

Claim 1:

Dardinski discloses *a method of source control, comprising:*

operating a source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Process Control System (source control system) resides on Workstation 11, col.8: 35-43; Controllers 10A-B, col.8: 44-59)

wherein said source control system comprises a plurality of source level control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., col.54: 22-38, automatically/manually source control levels)

to control versioning of objects used by said controller to provide said process control (e.g., FIG. 2, Controllers 10A-B communicates with Devices 12A, Sensors 24 and 26 to provide process control on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29);

enabling in said source control system said source control level (e.g., at least two control levels in Revision Levels, col.59: 49-54; Version History, col.59: 56 – col.60: 31); and

automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object of said objects (e.g., an object as Control Algorithm object, col.79: 21-25, col.77: 51-60; FIGs. 46-47, setting version number, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38),

wherein said first object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski discloses manual/automatic source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said selected and enabled source control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, selecting one of the options and clicking "OK", col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57) and

automatically setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; FIG. 10, with "Auto Check Out and In", automatically increasing the version numbers from 1 to 8); or

manually setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; col.12: 1-24; after selecting "Manual Checkout" in FIG. 8, manually "Undo CheckOut" in FIG. 6-7 to keep the version number as before checkout, col.10: 15-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *providing a capability to switch said enabled source control level of source control to another control level of said source control levels (e.g., col.59: 49-54, col.59: 56 – col.60: 31).*

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *automatically setting said version number is based on a degree of change to said first object (e.g., FIGs. 46-47, col.53: 54 – col.54: 38).*

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *storing attributes associated with said first object in a database* (e.g., col.79: 21-25; col.77: 51-60).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said source control system further comprises a third source control level, and wherein said first, second and third source control comprises control level none, control level basic, and control level full.* (e.g., col.70: 46 – col.71: 24).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said control level none, said method further comprises: receiving user-entered text for said version number; setting a created-by name set upon receiving a first save changes request* (e.g., col.8: 35-43; col.54: 22-38);

setting a modified-by name upon receiving a save changes request; setting a date-created date upon receiving said first save changes request (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43); and

setting a version date upon receiving said save changes request (e.g., FIG. 48, Revision Editor, col.54: 39-64; FIG. 49: Revision Dialog Box, col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said control level basic, said method further comprises: automatically incrementing said version number upon receiving a save changes request, including a first save changes request* (e.g., col.8: 44-59; col.43: 22-38);

setting a created-by name upon receiving said first save changes request; setting a modified-by name upon receiving said save changes request, including a first save changes request (e.g., col.59: 49-54; col.53: 54 – col.54: 38);

setting a date-created date upon receiving said first save changes request; setting a version date upon receiving said save changes request, including a first save changes request; and displaying said version number (e.g., FIG. 50: col.55; 23-63).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version number is incremented differently for minor changes than for major changes (e.g., col.55: 65 – col.56: 48).*

Claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *for said control level full, said method further comprises: supporting a qualification life cycle model; providing a version control system toolbar and menu (e.g., col.8: 35-43);*

automatically incrementing said version number upon check-in, including a first check-in wherein said version number is generated; displaying said version number; setting a created-by name upon said first check-in (e.g., col.9: 20-29);

setting a modified-by name upon said check-in, including said first check-in; in; setting a date-created date upon said check-in, including said first check-setting a version date upon said check-in (e.g., col.9: 33-43);

receiving a check-in comment; and providing a version history and audit trail (e.g., FIGs. 52-53: col.59: 57 – col.60: 31).

Claim 11:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said version number is incremented differently for minor changes than for major changes, according to user preferences (e.g., col.55: 65 – col.56: 48).*

Claim 12:

Dardinski discloses *a process control system, comprising:*

a network coupling said computer to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, Network 14, Workstation 11, Controllers 10A-B, Device 12, col.8: 23-59; FIG. 2, process control in blocks 29-32 to control Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col.9: 20-29);

said computer comprises a source control system with a selectable control level of source control, wherein said source control system controls versioning of at least one control strategy for said process control (e.g., selectable control level of source control as Control Levels, col.70:32-39; col.70: 46 – col.71: 25; a control strategy as Control Algorithm object, col.2: 25-42, col.9: 33-43);

wherein version numbers are set manually and automatically (e.g., col.79: 21-25; col.77: 51-60; col.53: 54 – col.54: 38);

wherein said at least one control strategy in said source control system is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said control strategy (e.g., Control Algorithm object (control strategy) is downloaded to field controllers/devices to provide control process on Valve 18, Tanks 20 and 22, col. 2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43, 20-29).

Dardinski discloses manual/automatical source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said enabled control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, selecting one of the options and clicking “OK”, col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57) and

automatically setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; FIG. 10, with “Auto Check Out and In”, automatically increasing the version numbers from 1 to 8); or

manually setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; col.12: 1-24; after selecting “Manual Checkout” in FIG. 8, manually “Undo CheckOut” in FIG. 6-7 to keep the version number as before checkout, col.10: 15-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Claim 13:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *a database to store source control information associated with said at least one control strategy, including a version number (e.g., col.79: 21-25; col.77: 51-60).*

Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable source control level of source control is no source control and further wherein a version number is entered manually when said at least one control strategy is saved (e.g., col.54: 39-64).*

Claim 15:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable source control level of source control is basic source control and further wherein a version number is automatically incremented when said at least one control strategy is saved (e.g., col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).*

Claim 16:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable source control level of source control is full source control and further wherein a version number is automatically incremented when said at least one control strategy is checked-in* (e.g., col.55: 23-63).

Claim 17:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *said selectable source control level of source control is selected from the group consisting of: a preference, a license, an installation configuration, and a user interface* (e.g., col.70: 32-39; col.70: 46 – col.71: 25).

Claim 18:

As set forth in claims 1 and 12, Dardinski discloses *a method for providing a source control system for a process control system, comprising: operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control, wherein said source control system controls versioning of objects; receiving in said source control system a selection from at least two control levels of source control for an object of said source control system; providing a user-enterable version number or an automatically incremented version number when said first object is stored, wherein said object is a control strategy loadable to said controller to provide said process control.*

Dardinski discloses manual/automatic source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said enabled control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, selecting one of the options and clicking “OK”, col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57) and

automatically setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; FIG. 10, with “Auto Check Out and In”, automatically increasing the version numbers from 1 to 8); or

manually setting a version number of a first object, depending on said selected and enabled source control level (e.g., col.11: 34-44; col.12: 1-24; after selecting “Manual Checkout” in FIG. 8, manually “Undo CheckOut” in FIG. 6-7 to keep the version number as before checkout, col.10: 15-37).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Claim 19:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *providing an automatically incremented version number when said first object is checked-in, if said selection is a third source control level of said plurality of control levels of source control (e.g., col.55: 23-63).*

Claim 20:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *changing said selection to another of said plurality of source control levels of source control (e.g., col.54: 39-64; col.54: 65 – col.55: 14).*

Claim 21:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated. Dardinski also discloses *updating attributes of said object based on said selection (e.g., col.53; 54 – col.54: 38).*

7. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski in view of Cronic (art of record, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0156719 A1) and further in view of Hammack.

Claim 22:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of providing configurable control levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 23-59);

at least one control strategy of said source control system; wherein said at least one control strategy is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said at least one control strategy (e.g., col.9: 20-29; col.2: 25: 42; col.9: 33-43).

Dardinski does not explicitly disclose *receiving a request for a control level of support, determining whether a full control level of support is licensed, determining whether an option for a basic control level of support is selected, setting said control level of support to full, if said full control level of support is licensed, and setting said control level of support to basic if said option is selected.*

However, in an analogous art of providing licensed software, Cronic further discloses:

receiving a request for one of a plurality of control levels of source control of support, determining whether said full control level of support is licensed (e.g., [0001]-[0004]),

wherein said plurality of control levels of source control comprises full, basic and none (e.g., [0036]-[0038]),

determining whether said full control level is licensed for said at least one control strategy (e.g., [0057]-[0059]);

determining whether an option for said basic control level of support is selected, setting said control level of support to full, if said full control level is licensed (e.g., [0059]-[0061]), and

setting said control level of support to basic if said option is selected (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]);

setting said control level of support to none as a default (e.g., [0036]-[0038], [0058]-[0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Dardinski discloses manually/automatically source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said enabled control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57)

providing a user-enterable version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a first control level and providing an automatically incremented version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a second control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59)

a plurality of control levels of source control including a full control level and a basic control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59 and Table 1, col.11: 1-33)

wherein said plurality of control levels comprise a first source control level and a second source control level that contains one or more features not contained in said first source control level (e.g., col.11: 1-33) and

wherein version numbers are set manually and automatically in said source control levels (e.g., col.11: 34-44).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski and Cronce. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated. Cronce further discloses *a default for said control level of support is none (e.g., [0037], [0058]).*

Claim 24:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of changing configurable control levels of support for a source control system, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control, wherein said source control system controls versioning of objects (e.g., FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59; FIG. 2, col.9: 20-29);

said first object of said objects, which is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object (e.g., col.2: 25-42; col.9: 33-43).

Cronce further discloses:

receiving a request from a user to change a control level, determining whether a full control level is licensed (e.g., [0001]-[0003]; [0058]-[0060]),

determining whether said request is to change from none to basic, determining whether said request is to change from basic to none (e.g., [0036]-[0038]),

performing said request when said request is to change from none to basic or from basic to none, and storing a new control level (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060], full, partial, basic, trial levels; user stops using software after trial period (none) or trial period expires).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Dardinski discloses manually/automatically source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said enabled control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57)

providing a user-enterable version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a first control level and providing an automatically incremented version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a second control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59)

a plurality of control levels of source control including a full control level and a basic control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59 and Table 1, col.11: 1-33)

wherein said plurality of control levels comprise a first source control level and a second source control level that contains one or more features not contained in said first source control level (e.g., col.11: 1-33) and

wherein version numbers are set manually and automatically in said source control levels of none and basic (e.g., col.11: 34-44).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski and Cronce. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Claim 25:

Dardinski discloses *a computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of updating version attributes based on a control level of source control, said method comprising:*

operating said source control system on a computer that is coupled via a network to a controller that communicates with one or more devices to provide process control, wherein said source control system controls versioning of objects (e.g. FIG. 1, col.8: 35-59);

said first object of said objects (e.g., col.2: 25-42);

determining whether said first object is new (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38);

setting a version number to a first version number, when said first object is new (e.g., FIG. 52, col.59: 57 – col.60: 5);

updating version attributes of said first object (e.g., col.53: 54 – col.54: 38); and

incrementing said version number, when said first object is not new, wherein said first object is loadable from said computer to said controller to provide said process control according to said object (e.g., FIG. 45, col.52: 7-14; col.59: 57 – col.60: 5).

Cronce further discloses:

determining whether an object is licensed, determining whether a basic control level is selected, receiving a save changes request for said object (e.g., [0036]-[0038], [0058]-[0060]),

updating version attributes of said object according to whether said full control level is licensed and whether said basic control level is selected (e.g., [0002], [0037], [0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cronce into that of Dardinski. One would have been motivated to do so to provide licensed software and control said licensed software usage based on full, partial, basic, or trial levels as suggested by Cronce (e.g., [0002], [0010-0012]).

Dardinski discloses manually/automatically source control levels (col.54: 22-38), different Revision levels (col.59: 49-54), and Control Levels (col.70-71) but does not explicitly disclose *[automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object] depending on said enabled control level.*

However, in an analogous art of version control, Hammack further discloses:

a plurality of source control levels that includes first and second source control levels (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59; col.13: 21-39);

receiving a selection of one of said first and second source control levels (e.g., col.11: 1-33);

enabling in said source control system said selected source control level of source control (e.g., col.12: 1-24; col.13: 41-57)

providing a user-enterable version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a first control level and providing an automatically incremented version number when said object is stored, if said selection is a second control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59)

a plurality of control levels of source control including a full control level and a basic control level (e.g., FIG. 8, col.10: 38-59 and Table 1, col.11: 1-33)

wherein said plurality of control levels comprise a first source control level and a second source control level that contains one or more features not contained in said first source control level (e.g., col.11: 1-33) and

setting a version number for said first object based on a user-enterable number (e.g., col.11: 34-44);

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hammack into that of Dardinski and Cronic. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain consistency between versionable items as suggested by Hammack (e.g., col.11: 19-33).

Conclusion

8. Applicants' amendment (at least in independent claims 12, 22, 24 and 25) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192